

order, then we should debate the IMF on its merits. But to stall the passage of this important legislation may weaken the hand of the U.S. Government and it may allow real problems to get worse. This is a situation where cooperation is critical.

Last week, I invited my colleagues to join me in an effort to establish a more cooperative, bipartisan approach to our foreign policy matters.

I, along with Senator HAGEL of Nebraska, am working to focus more energy seeking constructive solutions to American foreign policy problems. We intend to work together, to help reduce the rancor that partisan bickering tends to produce.

Just as engagement is the proper way of working with China, so too must we engage each other in order to better articulate Americans' interests and needs aboard.

We are many voices. We represent many ideas. Making progress requires constructive dialogue by all parties, and I encourage my colleagues engage in that discussion.

One final note, Mr. President. When President Clinton travels—when any American President travels overseas—he is the President of the United States of America. He is not a Republican President. He is not a Democratic President. He is the American President. When he travels, we in the U.S. Senate and the House of Representatives must give him our full cooperation. There are other times when he returns when we can debate what our foreign policy should be. But when it comes to foreign policy, we Americans will do much better, our stature in the world will be much higher, if we work out these differences among ourselves so that in the end we truly have a bipartisan foreign policy, a foreign policy that the Congress and the President have worked out together so that we stand taller and get more done than we otherwise might.

There is plenty of room here in domestic politics for partisanship. There is more than enough here for partisanship in domestic politics. I deplore most of it, even in domestic policy, but when it comes to foreign policy, we must stand together.

I urge Senators who have amendments to think twice before offering them, and perhaps bring up that issue when the President returns from his trip to China, because then the country is much better off.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1999

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I understand that Senator HUTCHINSON is now in a position to have the pending China human rights issue withdrawn.

However, before the Senator is recognized, let me put the Senate on notice as to where the bill is going, hopefully, for the next few days, which will take some cooperation, but I believe we are going to get it. I certainly hope so.

Following the withdrawal of the China issue and a statement by Senator HUTCHINSON—and I believe he is on the floor and ready to proceed—the Senate will resume consideration of the DOD authorization until approximately 5 p.m. At that time, the Senate will turn to the Coverdell A+ conference report for approximately 2 hours of debate tonight. The Senate will resume the conference report consideration on Wednesday at 9:30 and, therefore, the vote on final passage will occur around 11:30 on Wednesday on the Coverdell A+ education bill.

The Senate will then resume the DOD authorization bill. It is the hope of both leaders that the bill can move forward and be concluded by the close of business on Wednesday. I realize that is a big order, but we are calling on our leadership.

Mr. LEVIN. Wednesday of this week?

Mr. LOTT. Wednesday of this week, or Thursday at the latest, because we do have a lot of other work to do.

I realize there are some, I don't know, 150 amendments pending. Who are we kidding? That is not only not serious, that is totally laughable. This is the Department of Defense authorization bill which we need to do for our country. This is a bill that the Armed Services Committee has already done the bulk of the work on. While I realize there are a lot of policy issues, a lot of amendments that Senators would like to offer, I hope they will cooperate and we can get this bill completed in a reasonable period of time. This is the fifth day that we have been on the DOD authorization bill. Tomorrow will be the sixth day. So we need to get it concluded. I do now put the Senate on notice that I intend to call up H.R. 2358, relative to the China human rights issue, sometime after July 6, 1998. I will notify all Members when the date has been finalized so all Members will have time to prepare for it. This is an important issue for our country. Senators on the Democratic side have said we should not debate this while the President is going to China. I think, as a matter of fact, that the reverse is the case—that we should make our point, express the Senate's concern on these very important issues before the President goes, but not necessarily while he is there. It is an issue that we need to address further, and we are going to do that sometime after July 6.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, following a brief statement by Senator HUTCHINSON, the motion to recommit be automatically withdrawn.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. President, I thank the majority leader for the opportunity to work with him on this issue. I believe the China amendments I have offered have great value. The debate has been healthy, and the debate has been necessary. I, frankly, am willing to stand here and talk about human rights in China in general this week and next week, or as long as it takes. My great objective is to see these provisions become the public policy of this land.

In my opinion, the opponents of these amendments do not have a substantive leg to stand on. The only reason they have brought up to oppose these amendments involves the timing of the offering of these amendments. I remind my colleagues, once again, that I offered these and filed these amendments over a month ago. They have sought to obfuscate the issues, obscure the motivations, and place obstacles in the path of clean and substantive votes. The hollowness of the administration's policy is evident in their unwillingness to embrace these very modest human rights amendments.

Mr. President, if I might say again, the hollowness of the administration's China policy is evident in their unwillingness to embrace even those modest human rights amendments, and the length to which they have gone to block them from a vote on their merits, I think, speaks to the weakness of the policy. The policy has failed. The lack of outrage by this administration over the news today that China denied visa approval for Radio Free Asia reporters, I think, gives powerful testimony to the kind of acquiescence and concessionary spirit that characterizes this administration's policies. It is all too typical.

These issues will not go away, I assure you. Slave labor conditions, forced abortions, forced sterilizations, religious persecution, and proliferation of weapons of mass destruction are real issues. They are not fiction or partisan weapons; they are not used for some kind of political brownie points or "got-you" points. These are real issues that need to be debated, and we need to change our foreign policy in relation to these abuses that are ongoing in China.

If history teaches us anything, history teaches us that appeasement never works. The fact that this administration has refused even to offer the annual resolution at the U.N. convention in Geneva on human rights, I think, is indicative that even the smallest stands for human rights have gone by the wayside. I think it was Edmund Burke who said, "All that is necessary for evil to triumph is for good men to do nothing."

What the Senate has done today on China policy is nothing. The fact that these bills passed overwhelmingly in the House of Representatives, the fact that this body voted not to table them by 80-plus votes, indicates there is strength in their appeal. I want to express my appreciation to the majority

leader for the commitment he has made today to bring up H.R. 2358 in July for a vote and that the China issue will be addressed, and that whether it is Senator ABRAHAM or Senator WELLSTONE, or others, who have issues regarding bills regarding China, they will have an opportunity to debate them and to offer them. I compliment and commend the majority leader for that public commitment today. I will continue to press for votes on these provisions. I will look for legislative vehicles, if necessary.

These concerns that I have expressed are not, as they have been portrayed, partisan politics. This afternoon, I attended a press conference in which there were more Democrats than Republicans expressing their concern about the human rights policy of this administration toward China. This is not partisan politics. This has nothing to do with Republicans trying to make points. I probably have as much difference on some of them on my side of the aisle as I do on some of them on the other side of the aisle. So people can stand and say that we should not use foreign policy as an instrument of partisan politics. Well, this is not. This is a bipartisan concern about human rights abuses in China that have not improved under the policy of this administration.

There is much more that we need to do, on a bipartisan basis, to press the cause of basic human rights and democracy in China. It is my sincere hope that President Clinton will take every opportunity to elevate these issues during his trip, which he embarks on tomorrow.

I thank the Chair and yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion to recommit is withdrawn.

The motion to recommit was withdrawn.

Mr. BROWNBACK addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas is recognized.

AMENDMENT NO. 2407, AS MODIFIED

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I believe my amendment No. 2407 is now the pending business. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I send a modification to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is so modified.

The amendment (No. 2407), as modified, is as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the amendment, insert the following:

SEC. ____ SENSE OF SENATE ON NUCLEAR TESTS IN SOUTH ASIA.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) on May 11 and 13, 1998, the Government of India conducted a series of underground nuclear tests;

(2) on May 28 and 30, 1998, the Government of Pakistan conducted a series of underground nuclear tests;

(3) Although not recognized or accepted as such by the United Nations Security Council, India and Pakistan have declared themselves nuclear weapon states;

(4) India and Pakistan have conducted extensive nuclear weapons research over several decades, resulting in the development of nuclear capabilities and the potential for the attainment of nuclear arsenals and the dangerous proliferation of nuclear weaponry;

(5) India and Pakistan have refused to enter into internationally recognized nuclear non-proliferation agreements, including the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, and full-scope safeguards agreements with the International Atomic Energy Agency;

(6) India and Pakistan, which have been at war with each other 3 times in the past 50 years, have urgent bilateral conflicts, most notably over the disputed territory of Kashmir;

(7) the testing of nuclear weapons by India and Pakistan has created grave and serious tensions on the Indian subcontinent; and

(8) the United States response to India and Pakistan's nuclear tests has included the imposition of wide-ranging sanctions as called for under the Arms Export Control Act and the Nuclear Proliferation Prevention Act of 1994.

(b) SENSE OF SENATE.—The Senate—

(1) strongly condemns the decisions by the governments of India and Pakistan to conduct nuclear tests in May 1998;

(2) supports the President's decision to carry out the provisions of the Nuclear Proliferation Prevention Act of 1994 with respect to India and Pakistan and invoke all sanctions in that Act;

(3) calls upon members of the international community to impose similar sanctions against India and Pakistan to those imposed by the United States;

(4) calls for the governments of India and Pakistan to commit not to conduct any additional nuclear tests;

(5) urges the governments of India and Pakistan to take immediate steps, bilaterally and under the auspices of the United Nations, to reduce tensions between them;

(6) urges India and Pakistan to engage in high-level dialogue aimed at reducing the likelihood of armed conflict, enacting confidence and security building measures, and resolving areas of dispute;

(7) commends all nations to take steps which will reduce tensions in South Asia, including appropriate measures to prevent the transfer of technology that could further exacerbate the arms race in South Asia, and thus avoid further deterioration of security there;

(8) calls upon the President to seek a diplomatic solution between the governments of India and Pakistan to promote peace and stability in South Asia and resolve the current impasse;

(9) encourages United States leadership in assisting the governments of India and Pakistan to resolve their 50-year conflict over the disputed territory in Kashmir;

(10) urges India and Pakistan to take immediate, binding, and verifiable steps to roll back their nuclear programs and come into compliance with internationally accepted norms regarding the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction; and

(11) urges the United States to reevaluate its bilateral relationship with India and Pakistan, in light of the new regional security realities in South Asia, with the goal of preventing further nuclear and ballistic missile proliferation, diffusing long-standing regional rivalries between India and Pakistan, and securing commitments from them which, if carried out, could result in a calibrated lifting of United States sanctions imposed under the Arms Export Control Act and the Nuclear Proliferation Prevention Act of 1994.

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, we have a short period of time to be able to discuss this, because at 5 o'clock we go to the Coverdell amendment. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield. I think there is some discussion going on now that would enable 10 or 12 minutes on this very important amendment. I would like to take 2 minutes to join with my colleagues who are opposed to it. I would like to speak to it a little bit.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, first of all, have the yeas and nays been ordered on this issue?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No, they have not.

Mr. LOTT. On the Brownback amendment, the yeas and nays have not been ordered?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. LOTT. I understand there is a possibility we can go ahead and complete action on the Brownback issue after a statement by the Senator from Kansas and Senator WARNER, and perhaps Senator LEVIN would have something to say. If we can get that completed in a reasonable period of time, we can complete that and then go over to the Coverdell education issue.

Do we have any agreement on the time?

Mr. LEVIN. I don't know the length. I want to make inquiry on the yeas and nays issue. Is it not correct that the yeas and nays were ordered on the Feinstein first-degree amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. LEVIN. So the question is, if there is a need for the yeas and nays, we would leave it. If there is no need for a rollcall vote on that, we would need to vitiate, as I understand it, the yeas and nays on the first-degree Feinstein amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I urge the leadership of the committee to pursue this issue and, hopefully, get to a conclusion, and then we would go to the Coverdell education conference report immediately after that.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, is there a need for the yeas and nays on the first-degree Feinstein amendment? I ask whether the leader would have any objection, if there is no need for it, to vitiating the yeas and nays on the underlying Feinstein first-degree amendment.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, in response to the comment of the Senator from Michigan, there is no need for the yeas and nays.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, let me inquire again about the time so we can get a time agreement. Do we have some indication of how much time is needed? The Senator from Kansas needs how much?

Mr. BROWNBACK. I think we can do all of this in 15 minutes, with all parties being able to speak. That would be

my sense. I think I can get my comments done in about 7 minutes or so.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, it sounds to me like 20 minutes, equally divided, should be sufficient.

I ask unanimous consent that the time be limited to 20 minutes, equally divided, on this issue.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LEVIN. I have an inquiry of the Chair. Then there are no yeas and nays requested on either the first- or second-degree amendments at this time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have not yet been vitiated.

Mr. LEVIN. Would the leader have objection to vitiating the yeas and nays on the Feinstein amendment at this time?

Mr. LOTT. No.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the yeas and nays be vitiated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BROWNBACK addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas is recognized.

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, if I could inquire briefly of the Senator from Virginia who asked to speak on this amendment how much time he might desire on this?

Mr. WARNER. Three minutes.

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I ask that I be yielded 7 minutes of the 10 minutes allotted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator may proceed.

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, last month, following India's nuclear tests, I offered legislation to repeal section 620(e) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (otherwise known as the Pressler amendment). The Pressler amendment concerns restriction on the provision of military assistance and other transfers to Pakistan. When Pakistan blundered into responding to India's nuclear tests with tests of its own, this amendment not only became pointless symbolically, but because of existing sanctions law it was no longer relevant.

How rapidly events change. Last month when I proposed to repeal Pressler, the world was reacting in stunned disbelief to India's nuclear tests. At the time it seemed our only hope in stalling an all out nuclear arms race in South Asia was to offer Pakistan some security assurances, while at the same time urging them in the strongest terms not to be drawn into this dangerous display of nuclear saber rattling. Unfortunately, Pakistan did test, and we are now imposing sanctions rather than lifting them.

The month of May 1998 will be remembered as a time of nuclear anxiety. Tensions were high as the world watched India and Pakistan play nuclear roulette. June has brought some respite; India and Pakistan have declared a moratorium on further nuclear testing, and they are discussing bilat-

eral talks this month. I pray that this nuclear nightmare will pass.

The question of South Asia's regional security and our future relations with India and Pakistan remain issues of abiding concern. What has happened in South Asia is in many ways an indictment of the administration's failed foreign and nonproliferation policies. Consider that, at this very moment Congress is investigating the administration for its export control policies, particularly as they relate to China. These policies have made possible the wholesale proliferation of missile and nuclear technology, not only to Pakistan, but to others, such as Iran.

Mr. President, the testing of nuclear weapons by India and Pakistan, and the resulting security crisis in South Asia should be of grave concern to all of us. We must continue to condemn India and Pakistan's nuclear tests, and urge them to enact confidence and security building measures to reduce the likelihood of armed conflict. We must encourage a more involved role by the United States in seeking a diplomatic solution, and in providing leadership to resolve the conflict over the disputed territory in Jammu Kashmir. We should urge India and Pakistan to roll back their nuclear programs, and to come into compliance with the NPT. In addition the United States should develop policies which will promote stable, democratic, and economically thriving economies in India and Pakistan.

Last week the administration implemented sanctions against India and Pakistan. Although the scope of these sanctions is limited—ending economic aids, loans, and military sales—they will cast a negative pall on our relations until they are lifted. We should not underestimate the symbolic and economic impact of these sanctions. In India, America-bashing has taken the form of boycotting American products and vandalizing establishments selling them. There are reports that foreign capital is fleeing India and Pakistan, and financial markets there have already been badly hurt.

It is premature today to talk about lifting these sanctions, but I don't believe it is too early to begin planning for their gradual removal. For that reason I am considering legislation which could provide for the conditional removal of sanctions against India and Pakistan, based upon progress as outlined in the Geneva Communiqué.

I think the communiqués issued after the P-5 meeting in Geneva, and the G-8 meeting in London are reasonable appeals to India and Pakistan by the nuclear powers. Eighty other nations have joined the P-5 and the G-8 in denouncing these nuclear tests and calling for action by India and Pakistan. But, these appeals will not be met by India and Pakistan simply because they were announced in official communiqués.

The Geneva communiqué said that confidence building measures, incen-

tives, disincentives, and other actions are steps the international community can take in its relations with India and Pakistan. There are a number of actions we in Congress can take to move this process forward. Here are just a few.

We can listen to the concerns put forward by the Indian and Pakistani people. This week I will be leading a delegation to India and Pakistan to hold meetings with their leaders. My goal in visiting India and Pakistan is to hear, first hand, the views and concerns of their leadership. I also want to give assurances that this issue is very much on the front burner for the U.S. Congress. As I said in a hearing two weeks ago, it would be folly to isolate India and Pakistan at this time. We must be engaged. Unfortunately, in recent years U.S. foreign policy in India and Pakistan has been one of estrangement, not engagement.

We can work closely with the administration. This week I plan to invite the State Department Special Coordinator for India and Pakistan and interested members to a round table to explore how we might constructively engage India and Pakistan. I look forward to the results of those meetings.

In all of this—our meetings, our travel to the region, and our discussions with allies—our goal is to halt the proliferation of nuclear weapons in South Asia, restore regional security, and put our bilateral relationships with India and Pakistan back on track. We should settle for no less.

Mr. President, at the appropriate time I will ask for the passage of these bills. I do not believe that we will need a rollcall vote.

Mr. President, how much time is left on our side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMITH of Oregon). The Senator has 4 minutes.

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I would like to retain the remainder of that.

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

I ask unanimous consent that Terry Williams, a fellow in my office, be permitted privilege of the floor today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, although the Senator didn't say this, I am a cosponsor.

I want to speak briefly about it. I don't believe in the last decade that there has been a more disturbing fact and change of events on the subcontinent of Asia than the detonation of these nuclear tests. They have taken two countries, and indicated to the world that each has a lethal capacity which is far in excess of the bomb that exploded at Hiroshima.

This morning I detailed the unclassified analyses of what each of these countries has in the type of nuclear weapons, the type of launching devices, the type of plane, and the potential damage in terms of loss of life of humans that could occur. And it is quite mind-boggling.

This resolution essentially calls upon all freedom-loving countries, all members of the international community, to support the United States in its sanctions against both India and Pakistan. It calls for the Governments of India and Pakistan to commit to no further additional nuclear test, and it urges them to take immediate steps bilaterally, and under the auspices of the United Nations, to reduce tensions between them.

This morning I indicated how easy these tensions could increase. I mentioned the bomb on a train. I mentioned 25 people killed at a Hindu wedding, a product of Moslem terrorists. Any one of these events could bring about a miscalculation and produce a nuclear holocaust.

We also in this resolution urge India and Pakistan to take immediate binding and verifiable steps to roll back their nuclear programs and come into compliance with internationally accepted norms regarding proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. And we urge our country to reevaluate our bilateral relationship with India and Pakistan in light of the new regional security realities in south Asia with the goal of preventing further nuclear and ballistic missile proliferation, diffusing longstanding regional rivalry between India and Pakistan, and securing commitments from them, which, if carried out, could result in a calibrated lifting of U.S. sanctions imposed under the Arms Export Control Act and the Nuclear Proliferation Prevention Act of 1994.

Mr. President, I believe that this resolution has been cleared on all sides. I would certainly urge its passage by voice vote.

Mr. WARNER addressed the Chair.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. I thank the Chair. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I likewise ask to be made a cosponsor of this amendment. I think it is a very responsible effort by our distinguished colleagues, the principal sponsors, and I think the Senate will endorse this, as it will in a voice vote momentarily.

But I would just bring to the attention of colleagues, if we do not handle responsibly this crisis—we, the United States—together with our principal allies, it will signal to other nations that they should begin to look towards the development of weapons of mass destruction. In all likelihood, they cannot afford the expense associated with nuclear weapons, but it will propel them into further areas of chemical and biological.

So that, to me, is the seriousness of this problem, if we do not handle it fairly, evenhandedly, and with a note of understanding. And that brings me to my question, because section (b)(3) urges other nations to impose sanctions. I just wondered, listening very carefully to the Senator from Kansas, who said he is going to travel over

there to try to work out greater confidence-building measures and also to try to increase engagement, am I misreading that section as being possibly in conflict with what I hear my two distinguished colleagues as saying?

Mr. BROWNBACK. If I may respond to the Senator from Virginia, it was our intent that the United States has put on a set of sanctions via the GLENN amendment that were automatic, and we thought it important to state that if we are going to take that position, we should be urging other nations to do so as well. Yet, in the longer term, as we get further out here, I think we should be dealing in a dialog of, how do we get these lifted on a step-by-step, confidence-building measure?

At the present time, we are in a unilateral sanctions position, and I think we should urge other nations to join us in that statement, but at the same time I want us to start building the confidence and moving away from those if we can't get other nations to join us in this effort.

Mr. WARNER. I would certainly urge that be done because, in reality, we are not here to say who is at fault; both bear a heavy sense of culpability. Unfortunately, India initiated it. I don't know—as time goes on, perhaps there will be an answer—what recourse Pakistan had. Had not the current leadership taken that action, they might well have been either run out of office or forced out of office. So we cannot be unmindful of the political instabilities in these nations and the reality that if one did it, what recourse the other had other than to do it.

Now, two wrongs do not make a right, but I will listen carefully, and I hope that this section does not send a signal of any rigidity as we should be pursuing greater engagement.

I hope the international community would offer to arbitrate the complexity of the Kashmir problem. It has been there for a long time, and very often, an outside, unbiased, objective collection of nations could come in and render some helpful assistance to alleviate that problem, which is an absolute crisis. Talk about human rights and suffering. There is a war taking place every day—shelling, killing—and it must be brought to a stop.

So I wish to associate myself with the remarks of my two colleagues from Kansas and California. I congratulate them. I think it is a very important measure for the Senate to adopt. But I do hope that you will, on your mission, and others will do what we can to increase engagement and provide for solutions.

Mr. BROWNBACK addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. BROWNBACK. I appreciate the comments and wisdom of the Senator from Virginia. We are attempting further engagement.

I also want to recognize my colleague from California, Senator FEINSTEIN,

who has been a leader in this overall effort, as well as Senator HARKIN and Senator ROBB. The whole Senate, hopefully, will be engaged in this matter.

Mr. President, if no one else seeks to speak—I guess perhaps there is somebody else. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's 10 minutes have expired.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, how much time on our side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 6 minutes 30 seconds.

Mr. LEVIN. I will not use it all. I just want to congratulate the Senators from California and Kansas for their energy, for their persistence, their efforts. It is a very significant statement for the Senate and, I believe, for the world. The concern that is reflected in this resolution—this amendment now—is very significant in terms of what our fears and concerns are. These tests have not brought security to India and Pakistan; they have brought insecurity to the region. They have made the world a lot less secure place. And now we must both state that and seek to try to put this genie back in the bottle to the extent that those tests have helped to release it.

The modifications are important modifications to make sure this is an evenhanded resolution, which it is, following the tests by the two countries. And our staffs have worked very closely with your two staffs. We wish to thank you again for your efforts in pursuing this, and we hope that this resolution is promptly and totally adopted by this Senate.

Mr. MACK. Mr. President, I rise today to express my concern with the pending amendment.

I deeply regret the circumstances regarding India's decision to detonate nuclear devices. But the increased instability in South Asia has been caused by China's proliferation policies, a U.S. foreign policy which favors China over India, and the licensing of technologies by the United States which enhances China's military capabilities.

So I wonder why we would consider strongly condemning the Indian government—the democratically elected Indian government—for taking legal actions in its perceived self interest. And I further question this amendment occurring on a day in which the Senate could not vote to express our concerns with the reprehensible actions taken by the communist party officials running the People's Republic of China.

Mr. President, India has broken no international laws or agreements by choosing to test nuclear devices, and India is not a known proliferator of weapons or weapons technology. We know, however, that China is a proliferator. Of particular concern is Chinese proliferation of weapons and technologies to Pakistan. But today the Senate will vote to condemn India and fail to vote to condemn China.

India and China went to war in 1962. To this day, China continues to occupy 15,000 square miles of Indian territory

in Ladakh and it claims sovereignty over the entire 35,000 square miles of India's Northeastern most province. The pending amendment rightly points out that India has not joined the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty. But the amendment fails to recognize that the NPT seeks to ensure the current five nuclear powers alone are able to possess nuclear weapons. This means that China can maintain its arsenal, but India cannot. India has not signed the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty for similar reasons.

Mr. President, there appears to be a serious contradiction represented in our foreign policy which makes no sense to me. It is for this reason that I cannot support this amendment and will vote against it. I yield the floor.

Mr. BROWNBACK addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. BROWNBACK. I urge adoption of the amendment.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time is yielded back.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 2407), as modified, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the first-degree amendment.

The amendment (No. 2405), as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I just say one final thing. I appreciate the committee working with us, the ranking member and chairman of the committee; I thank them very much.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I did not hear whether there was a motion to reconsider. If not, I move to reconsider that vote.

Mr. BROWNBACK. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. THURMOND. As I understand, we are due back on this bill at 12 o'clock tomorrow. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That has not yet been ordered.

Mr. THURMOND. The defense authorization bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It has not yet been ordered.

Mr. THURMOND. Do we anticipate being back at 12 o'clock tomorrow?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is the answer to the question.

Mr. THURMOND. I would like for Members who have any amendments to offer to come down and offer these amendments. We have got to push this bill. This is a vital bill. It concerns every citizen in this country. This defense bill is very, very important, and we do not want to be delayed in carrying it on and on. Let's act promptly and show the world that we stand for a strong defense.

I yield the floor.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, let me join the chairman of the committee in urging our colleagues to bring amendments to the floor tomorrow, as we anticipate, when we return to this bill at around noon. We now have removed a major roadblock to considering other amendments, so the floor will be open at that time for other amendments to be considered, and we hope our colleagues will bring those to the floor.

I note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EDUCATIONAL SAVINGS AND SCHOOL EXCELLENCE ACT OF 1998—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, I now ask that the Chair lay before the Senate the conference report to accompany H.R. 2646, the Coverdell A+ education bill, and it be considered under the provisions of the earlier consent agreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2646), have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses this report, signed by majority of the conferees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of the conference report.

(The conference report is printed in the House proceedings of the RECORD of June 15, 1998.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, first I would like to commend the conferees. I would like to commend Chairman ARCHER of the conference committee. I believe they have brought to the Senate, as they did the House, a sweeping education reform proposal that will affect millions upon millions of American children trying successfully to obtain a quality education. They have obtained a bipartisan approach that has been embraced by some of the more distinguished Members of the other side who will speak to this. To paraphrase Senator LIEBERMAN in the press conference at the announcement of the conference report, he said it was clear to him that the Republican leadership had reached out to his party and to the President, and he thought the time had come for their side to reach out as well. And, therefore, we now begin a discussion of the conference report on education reform in the United States.

Mr. President, first I would like to talk, just briefly, about the number of

people who will be affected if what is clearly going to pass the Senate with a very strong vote and has passed the House already and will be sent to the President to consider, is signed by the President. In the first case, some 14 million families will open education savings accounts who are the parents of 20 million children. Think about it. That is about half of the school population in kindergarten through high school that would be the beneficiary—half of the school population of the United States. These are precarious times. As we come to a new century, we have a new tool to use to help parents see to the needs of their children.

What has always been amazing to me about this proposal—which the other side has pointed out almost ridiculously, but I will come to that—is that it is a very modest form of tax relief because it allows the interest buildup on these savings accounts to accrue without being taxed so long as the account is used for an educational purpose. The tax relief, therefore, for these education savings accounts over the next 5 years, is a little over \$1 billion, \$1 billion to \$1.3 billion.

What is amazing is how little incentive it takes to make Americans do huge things, because that limited tax relief will cause those 14 million families on behalf of their 20-plus million children to save over \$5 billion. Over 10 years it will cause them to save over \$12 billion. It is just amazing.

I was just reading a report where the savings rate in the United States has plunged to 3.9 percent, one of the lowest levels in a half a century. So this becomes win/win, because not only does it cause Americans to save, and large sums of money, but it is for education, the Nation's No. 1 problem by everybody's account as we come to the new century.

It does a lot of other things as well. The conference report will help over 1 million students deal with the costs of higher education because it helps qualified State tuition programs and protects them from tax burdens, and that makes them more valuable. Over 1 million students will benefit from this; 21 States already have these plans and 17 have them under consideration. It has a component in the conference report which came out of the Senate Finance Committee, which will help over 1 million employees expand their continuing education. It will help 1 million employees seek continuing education because it will allow employers to spend up to \$5,250 on behalf of an employee's continuing education, and it is not seen as taxable income to the employee. So over a million employees will benefit from it.

It has an arbitrage rebate exception for public school bonds, which will help the construction of public schools.

The provision that was inserted in the Finance Committee from Senator GRAHAM, which I believe is a very good provision which would be broader on school construction, did not become a